

November 7, 2013

RE: Proceeding 13-814

Commissioners:

I appreciate the opportunity to comment, and wish to commend the FCC on a program that works well.

I support increasing the funding of E-rate to \$5 billion annually to allow all applicants the opportunity to receive Priority 2 funds, as well as P1 funds. I have seen firsthand what districts have been able to accomplish in extending internet access, especially wireless access using P2 funds. Without these funds, students simply would not have access to 21st century learning environments.

Short of increasing the funding, I support gradually adjusting the discount matrix from 90% to 80%, or even 75%. This would enable more districts to get funded annually. By having more "skin in the game," districts and vendors might be more incentivized to keeping prices as low.

The Eligible Services List should be updated to include redundant paths. In order to provide a learning environment that embraces BYOD and 1:1 to support Common Core State Standards, coupled with the online Smarter Balanced Assessment, districts will need to create and support redundant paths to ensure adequate bandwidth at peak usage times.

State approved tech plans should remain a requirement for P2 funding. As a tech plan approver for the State of California, I have witnessed time and time again how often the only time all stakeholders, within a district, come together is when it's time to renew the education technology plan. There is immense value in the collaborative process, as well as high value in developing and articulating a shared vision of how ed tech will support teaching and learning.

Lastly, I do not support a per pupil funding model. Smaller, often rural districts always come on the short end, while the larger, metropolitan districts get the lion's share. This only widens the gap, and the funds essentially become an annual subsidy, rather than funds based on actual district needs.

Thank you,

Dana Greenspan